

## Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed June 2, 2005. The fee for presentation of multiple dependent claims is included herewith. A Petition for Extension of Time to Respond is submitted herewith, together with the appropriate fee.

Claims 1-61 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-61. The present Reply cancels claims 1-11, 13-24, and 26-61, amends claims 12 and 25, and adds new claims 62-70, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 12, 25, and 62-70. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested.

### I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Claims 1-9, 11-19, 23-25, 28-29, 32-36, 39-40, 42-48, and 51-60 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Danknick et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,901,286).

Claims 10, 20, 22, 30-31, and 61 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Danknick* in view of *Vertelney et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,341,293).

Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Danknick*.

Claims 26-27, 37-38, and 49-50 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Danknick* as applied to claim 25, in view of *Vertelney* and further in view of *Hoirup et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,397,054).

Claim 41 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Danknick* as applied to claim 40, and further in view of *Cohen et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,324,543).

## II. Response to Rejections

### The Present Invention

*Danknick* deals with the fairly narrow problem of establishing a communication session between a work station and a printer peripheral. In contrast, the present invention deals with the problem of representing common entities as documents so as to extend the document-centric model of computing to physical and virtual entities. By bringing these entities into the sphere of electronic documents, existing tool and general purpose applications that understand and manipulate documents may be used to interact with the various entities. In essence, electronic documents become a metaphor for the interactive objects in both the virtual and the physical worlds, rather than simply a metaphor for physical documents. *Danknick*, with its more narrow focus on creating a single communication session, does not deliver these broader benefits.

Thus, the present invention is directed to a much different problem than is *Danknick*.

As Amended Every Pending Claim Depends From Claims 12 and Thus Calls For the Use of an Active Property Having Associated Executable Code That Affects the Behavior of the Document Within the Document Management System And So Is Patentably Distinct From *Danknick*

One of the inventive aspects of the present invention is the use of "active properties" which are defined in the specification as executable code which either alters the documents or otherwise affects the documents' behavior within the document management system. On pages 4, 8 and 12 of the 6/02/05 rejection the Examiner claims that the printer or copier "configuration settings" are analogous to the properties of the

claims of the application. However, it is respectfully submitted that even if these configuration settings were analogizable to the static properties discussed in the application specification, they are not at all comparable to the active properties of the application as are now recited and claimed in every pending claim. As stated, these active properties have executable code which either alters the documents or otherwise affects the documents' behavior within the document management system. Such active properties are not contemplated by Danknick. For this reason, then, the claims as currently amended patentably distinguish over Danknick and should be allowed.

As Amended Claim 25 And All Claims Depending Therefrom Call For an Ability to Edit or Amend the Document Using an Outside Application, Which Is Something That Is Not Contemplated By or Needed in the Danknick Reference

On pages 9 and 10 the Examiner raises that Danknick "teaches inputting a request for a web page into an icon displayed on a browser" as meeting certain limitations of claims 24 and 25. Claim 25 has been amended, however, and as amended it is clear that claim 25 is directed to the ability using the present invention to edit documents using outside application programs. It is respectfully submitted that Danknick's teaching of "inputting a request for a web page into an icon displayed on a browser" does not anticipate or render obvious the claims as amended, which clearly recite the document editing limitation in the newly added claim language: "in order to modify the document representing said entity." Danknick has no need for a document editing feature in its structure and so does not anticipate this limitation.

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

Enclosed is a PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for extending the time to respond up to and including today, November 29, 2005.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 29, 2005

By: Eric Hoover  
Eric N. Hoover  
Reg. No. 37,355

Customer No. 23910  
FLIESLER MEYER LLP  
Four Embarcadero Center, Fourth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-4156  
Telephone: (415) 362-3800